

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application

Inventors: Jeffrey W. Carr

Appl. No.: 10/002,035

Confirm. No.: 5043

Filed: November 1, 2001

Title: APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR
ATMOSPHERIC PRESSURE REACTIVE
ATOM PLASMA PROCESSING FOR
SHAPING OF DAMAGE FREE SURFACES

PATENT APPLICATION

Art Unit: 1763

Examiner: Allan W. Olsen

Customer No. 23910

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted electronically to the United States Patent and Trademark Office via the EFS-Web system and addressed to **Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**, on October 10, 2007.

/Michael L. Robbins/_____(Signature)
Michael L. Robbins, Reg. No. 54,774
Signature Date: October 10, 2007

**STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.2**

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW is submitted in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.2, and is intended to be a complete and proper recollection of the interview conducted on September 7, 2007.

Remarks

This Summary of the Interview is submitted in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.2, and is intended to be a complete and proper recordation of the interview conducted on September 7, 2007, for the above-identified patent application.

I. SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY

A. Brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or demonstration conducted

The interview was conducted telephonically and did not include an exhibit or demonstration.

B. Identification of the claims discussed

The Independent Claims were discussed.

C. Identification of specific prior art discussed

US 6,218,640 (Selitser).

D. Identification of the principal proposed amendments of the Applicant

None amendments were proposed.

E. General thrust of the principal arguments of the Applicant and the Examiner

Prosecuting attorney discussed the difference between applicant's claimed auxiliary gas and Selitser's sheath gas. Specifically, prosecuting attorney pointed out that applicant uses three concentric tubes that are all within the RF discharge coil whereas in Selitser, the coil is disposed between the two outmost tubes. Prosecuting attorney suggested that applicant's use of the auxiliary gas flow to adjust the position of the plasma discharge distinguishes applicant's concentric tube configuration from that of Selitser's.

F. Other pertinent matters discussed

No other matters were discussed.

G. Outcome of the interview

Examiner Olsen took comments under advisement, and indicated that the finality of the previously mailed Office Action was removed.

II. CONCLUSION

Applicant requests that this STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW be entered and that it reflect compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.2, which requires that a complete written statement as to the substance of the interview be made of record.

Applicant further respectfully requests that the REPLY TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION mailed March 26, 2007 be considered in light of the above comments, and that a Notice of Allowance be

provided. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting the issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael L. Robbins/

Date: October 10, 2007

By: _____
Michael L. Robbins
Reg. No. 54,774

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California St., 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800